UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/575,781	04/14/2006	Marcus Eh	51103	3806	
1609 7590 10/15/2009 ROYLANCE, ABRAMS, BERDO & GOODMAN, L.L.P. 1300 19TH STREET, N.W. SUITE 600 WASHINGTON,, DC 20036			EXAMINER		
			BROWN, COURTNEY A		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1616		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			10/15/2009	PAPER	

## Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/575,781	EH ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
COURTNEY BROWN	1616	

	COURTNEY BROWN	1616	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the d	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>05 October 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS A		-	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	the same day as filing a Notice of <i>i</i> eplies: (1) an amendment, affidavial (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires <u>4</u> months from the mailing date	of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adno event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE ).	g date of the final rejection FIRST REPLY WAS FII	n. LED WITHIN TWO
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of the hortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
	out prior to the data of filing a brief	will not be entered be	001100
3.  The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, because it is a final rejection in better it is a final rejection in better it is a final rejection. (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better it is a final rejection.	sideration and/or search (see NOTw);	ΓE below);	
appeal; and/or			
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a c		ected claims.	
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.17	* **		OTOL 224)
<ol> <li>The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12</li> <li>Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):</li> </ol>		mpilant Amendment (i	310L-324).
<ol> <li>Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s).</li> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be alled</li> </ol>		imaly filed amondmor	ot cancaling the
non-allowable claim(s).	owabie ii subiliitted iii a separate, t	illiely filed affieridifier	it cancelling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is proved the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  Claim(s) allowed:		l be entered and an e.	xplanation of
Claim(s) allowed Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-7</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	before an an the date of filing a Nie		h = = = t = = = d
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>	sufficient reasons why the affidavi	t or other evidence is	necessary and
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a
10.	of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
<ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered but <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u></li> </ol>	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i> (s). (13. Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
<u> </u>			
	/Ernst V Arnold/ Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 1616	

Continuation of 3. NOTE: Applicant has amended the instant claims wherein the instant method requires a rapid release of a fragrance. This newly added limitation would require further search and consideration. For example, 'rapid' is a relative term and may not only be indefinite but also new matter. The Examiner did not find the word 'rapid' verbatim in the specification as filed and the specification teaches "controlled release" on page 1, line 2 and page 35, line 5. From MPEP 2163.06: "Applicant should therefore specifically point out the support for any amendments made to the disclosure." Applicant has not directed the Examiner to the support in the specification for the amendments. Thus Applicant has support for "controlled release" but not for "rapid release".

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The arguments filed October 5, 2009 do not place any of the claims in condition for allowance because of the newly added limitation wherein the instant method requires a rapid release of a fragrance. Thus, the claims as amended would require further search and examination. The prior rejection filed June 9, 2009 still meets the limitations of the previously presented claims filed December 5, 2008 and the arguments are not persuasive to overcome the rejection. Please refer to the Final rejection, mailed on June 9, 2009 for any clarifications. Applicant has amended instant claim 1 to recite "acidic" versus "sour". Thus the 35 USC 112, first paragrah written discription rejection has been withdrawn.

The claims remain rejected.